

all their focus on the leak. It is because they don't want to focus on Roe, where, again, they are on the wrong side of history and the wrong side of the American people.

Their hypocrisy and refusal to own this decision is utterly shameful. The end of a constitutional right to choose is not some small or inconsequential subject; it is huge. It touches on one of the most personal, most private, most important decisions a woman can make regarding her body.

So it is worth saying again: Without Senate Republicans working years to pack our courts, without them changing the rules of the Senate to confirm three ideological Justices, Roe would not—would not—be on the brink of being overturned.

And don't take my word for it. Leader McConnell himself expected and hoped for this outcome. When asked in 2019 what confirming President Trump's Justices meant for the anti-abortion movement, he said:

There are a number of [States] who have enacted new legislation [that] would be winding its way up through the courts and [it] gives us an opportunity to begin to pick away at Roe v. Wade.

"Pick away at Roe v. Wade."

So what the Court did was not an aberration; it was a plan, a plan by Senate Republicans, a plan by Leader McConnell.

Senate Republicans spent years rubberstamping one radical Trump judge after another onto the Federal bench in order to "pick away at Roe."

Many of these judges were wildly unqualified. Many of them were out of step—far out of step—from the American mainstream.

What is more, every single Republican also changed Senate rules to confirm not one, not two, but three Trump Justices to the U.S. Supreme Court, assuring a 6-to-3 conservative majority. Some of these Justices lied to the Senate by misrepresenting their views on respecting precedent when it came to decisions like Roe.

And, of course, after the death of Justice Scalia, Leader McConnell took the unprecedented and truly destructive step of preventing the Senate from considering the nomination of Merrick Garland.

So nobody here should be fooled. Nobody in America should be fooled. The Republican leader might not say it, but the end of Roe is a culmination of actions taken by the Republican leader and the Republican Party writ large to skew our courts with hard-right, ideological, vehemently anti-choice judges.

And now that they are close to succeeding, they can't even bring themselves to own up to their own actions because they know—they know—just how strongly the American people oppose restricting the right to choose.

But this is not the end of the story. Republicans cannot hide from the American people and cannot hide their role in bringing Roe to an end. They will have to answer to the people this

month, this year, and especially this November, when American voters go to the polls. And we are going to vote here in the Senate to make clear where every single Member stands on the right to choose.

Few issues—few issues—are as personal, as private, and as important to Americans as whether or not to have an abortion. The Nation will be watching to see who in this Chamber will defend this precious right to choose and who will stand with the Roberts Court to destroy this right in one fell swoop.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. President, now, on another subject—on a very different subject—to-night, the Senate—or, this afternoon, the Senate will begin holding votes on as many as 28 motions to instruct before the conference committee begins the work of finalizing our jobs and competition bill.

Twenty of those motions to instruct come from Republicans, a sign of the immense good faith Democrats have shown Republicans in getting this bill over the finish line.

For the information of all Members, we are going to be voting late into the night to get through as many of the motions to instruct as we can. I ask Members to vote quickly, to stay near the floor, so we can keep the process moving smoothly and as quickly as we can on the floor of the Senate.

Once again, I thank my dear colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

FOOD SECURITY

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader.

I will resume my comments about food security.

As I mentioned earlier, across the world now, we not only have 276 million people who now face acute food insecurity—as I said, meaning that they are in immediate danger of not being able to find their next meal—but what is ahead is an exacerbation of that problem. Another 47 million people will likely face these same dangers by the end of this year.

So a food security problem, which was a substantial problem before the pandemic, made ever worse by the pandemic, has gotten much worse because of the war in Ukraine—all caused by an attack on a sovereign country by a brutal dictator, Mr. Putin.

So this is one of the many reasons why this war in Ukraine—or why all of us, I should say, across the free world have a stake in what happens in Ukraine.

I wanted to also highlight what the United States is doing in the midst of this terrible food insecurity crisis.

We can't afford to forget and should not forget about the tens of millions who are struggling to survive as a result of this invasion. To feed all of those in need, the World Food Programme, which does such good work all across the globe—goes into conflict

zones to provide food to people—that program estimates it will take more than \$18 billion.

The United States must not share this burden alone, but if we don't lead the way, no one will. That is true in so many instances. It is true with regard to the President's leadership against Mr. Putin by helping the people of Ukraine; it is also true in terms of American leadership on food security.

President Biden's request for \$33 billion for all aspects of the challenge in Ukraine doesn't include enough, in my judgment. It includes \$1.6 billion for food security and humanitarian assistance. Now, that sounds like a lot of money, but it is not enough to meet the moment.

And despite my consistent urging, Congress has appropriated flat funding for the U.S. food security program, Feed the Future, over the last 10 years. Adjusting for inflation, the program has been cut by almost a third of its total programming, from almost \$1.5 billion in today's dollars to just over \$1 billion.

So, today, we face the same global food crisis which the Feed the Future Program was originally created to address after the 2008 recession. So after a recession, we had a global food security challenge, and now after a pandemic, and exacerbated by the war in Ukraine, we have potentially an even greater challenge.

So we must again rise to the challenge. When I say "we," I mean the U.S. Government, the Congress, the branch of our government that appropriates money, has to rise to the challenge by providing the resources that are necessary to feed those who face famine—not just missing a meal here and there, famine itself.

We have got to support these smallholder farmers, who are the backbone of the world's food supply, and sustainably strengthen food systems to protect against the next war, the next pandemic, the next drought, or the next flood.

So that is why I am leading a letter to appropriators urging robust funding of all—all—global food security accounts in the fiscal year 2023 budget, specifically calling for an almost \$200 million increase just for the Feed the Future Program, not to mention those other global food security programs and accounts.

This funding will only put a dent in the growing food security crisis, but it will inspire our allies and our partners to follow us. America leads the world in so many ways, and, fortunately, most of the time on food security we have led the world as well.

We need to do that again. We need to lay the groundwork for a more secure food future and save tens and tens of thousands of lives—potentially a lot more than that—in the immediate future.

NATIONAL CRITICAL CAPABILITIES DEFENSE ACT

Mr. President, I will move to one final topic before I conclude. This is a

topic we are hearing more about because of the pandemic and because of legislation we are working on right now.

Today and tomorrow, as the majority leader made reference to, we are going to be voting here in the Senate on measures ahead of a conference—kind of a coming together of the House and Senate—to work out differences on landmark legislation aimed at addressing U.S. economic competition with the Chinese Communist Party and investing in American workers.

As the House and Senate proceed to this conference on the Senate-passed U.S. Innovation and Competition Act and the House version, which is called the COMPETES Act, I urge bipartisan leadership in both the House and the Senate to negotiate in good faith and ensure substantive provisions that support the interests of American workers, supply chains, and security.

Key among these provisions in the trade title is the House COMPETES Act and within it, the bipartisan, bicameral National Critical Capabilities Defense Act, which both Senator CORNYN and I wrote and have led the effort on to pass this legislation. In the House, Representatives PASCRELL and DELAURO have worked on this as well.

The pandemic exacerbated a problem that has been decades in the making. Here it is: The United States has ceded its manufacturing power to other countries—especially countries like China—that don't play by the rules. From the PPE shortages that we all know so much about at the beginning of the pandemic—I mean, we couldn't even provide enough masks, gloves, and gowns for our own people. That was an American failure that was long in the making. We cannot—cannot—allow that to happen. But, of course, PPE doesn't end the story; we have ceded our manufacturing power to other parts of the world in so many other ways.

For too long, corporations have prioritized their profits over anything else. They have prioritized those profits by offshoring their manufacturing to countries with low labor standards that undercut American workers, thereby lowering the cost of design and production all across the board. So offshoring our manufacturing capabilities—the best in the world, I would argue—why would we offshore it like we have over a generation? Offshoring our supply chain has gotten so bad that it is now putting our economic security at risk, but it is also putting our national security at risk.

The issue is that we don't even know how bad the problem is. At its core, this bill, the National Critical Capabilities Defense Act, is a transparency effort. We need to know how much we are relying on foreign adversaries for both the design and manufacturing of goods that are critical to our economic and national security interests. Once we know that, we can start investing in domestic manufacturing strategically,

which will lower costs for families, provide good-paying jobs to American workers, and ensure that we are no longer relying on adversaries for the basic functions of our economy.

This is a commonsense policy, and that is why this bill has bipartisan support in the House and the Senate. Members of the Senate are coming together on this who often don't agree on much but agree that we have to protect our manufacturing base. We cannot be at the mercy of other countries in a pandemic or more generally when it comes to our economic interests but also our security interests.

That is why Biden administration officials, from the National Security Advisor to the Secretary of Commerce, have acknowledged a need to review outbound investment. Even former National Security Advisor H.R. McMaster proposed some form of a government outbound investment review mechanism.

I recognize that this is not an easy problem to solve. It is not an easy mechanism to create within the bureaucracy of the Federal Government. But this critical moment calls for having to do the hard work to ensure that we are meeting the economic and national security challenges of the day.

This is a moment to do the work to set our government and the American people up for success in a world where the Chinese Communist Party will continue to incentivize American investment into that country and away from the United States, thereby eroding the foundation of American power, which is leveraging our economic might to uphold liberal Democratic norms—the same norms that are being challenged every day in places like Ukraine.

So this is why I urge my colleagues in leadership to work with me and to work with others in a bipartisan, bicameral effort to negotiate and hammer out the details of this legislation and to ensure the inclusion of this critical legislation in a final competitiveness package.

If a company is outsourcing technology, outsourcing a product that compromises or has the potential to compromise our national security, we not only should know about that, but we should have the opportunity as a government whose first duty is to protect our national security. That same Government, the U.S. Government, should be able to review those transactions and make a determination about whether or not that outsourcing will put us at a disadvantage. That is a reasonable request for people in both parties, both Houses, and the administration, and it is about time we did this. It is long overdue.

So this isn't simply that we couldn't make enough masks and had to rely upon other countries in a pandemic. That was bad enough. That was embarrassing enough. This is a lot more than PPE; this is about our economic security and our national security.

There is no reason why those kinds of investments that companies make

every day—sometimes without any thought about what it will do to our security—there is no reason why that shouldn't be the subject of an appropriate review to protect our national security.

With that, I would yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING ORRIN G. HATCH

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, much has already been said on this floor as we express our love and admiration for our friend and former colleague, Senator Orrin Hatch of Utah. He was not like any other Senator. Orrin was the best of all of us, and our household is very sad to hear of his passing.

I will never forget the time he took to answer calls from an obscure State senator from Oklahoma. If you haven't figured it out, that was me. He had a way about him with everyone he met, an unwavering kindness and gentle nature that Kay and I will miss deeply. You don't see a lot of that in the U.S. Senate. We were close long before I was even in the House. Orrin was the one whom I would go to for wisdom. We had the same love for Jesus and everything that we hold dear.

I will always remember his humor, but he also gave his best advice. He was not just a friend but a confidante. Whether he was talking about Scripture or history, he had a way of saying things that brought people together. You don't see that today. You see people fighting each other, and that is what people always say. When I go back home to Oklahoma, people talk about, why don't you guys get along? Well, we do. It just doesn't come across that way. But it did with him.

I think back fondly on everything that we did while Orrin was in office. Despite strong opposition at the time, myself and Senators Hatch, Chambliss, and THUNE were able to pass an amendment permitting the Air Force to enter into a multiyear procurement for a total of 60 F-22s during the 2007 NDAA. The NDAA is something we pass every year. It is the National Defense Authorization Act. And that happened that year. Now, that turned out to be one-third of our total force in one effort, one NDAA effort.

The argument against the amendment at the time was that we didn't need such an air-dominant fighter, but we knew we were making an investment in the future of our defense. Orrin had that foresight. He was always looking to the future. In advancing years,